

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action mailed April 21, 2004, finally rejecting all the claims pending in the application, namely claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12 and 14-18.

The specification has been amended to include a "Field of Invention" heading, as well as a description of the field of the invention. The specification has also been amended to include a "Description of Related Art" heading. In view of these amendments to the specification, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to the specification.

Claim 1 has been amended to now recite "determining whether the first entity is informed of updates based on one of the one or more update values." Claim 1 has also been amended to now recite "sending the changed value to the first entity based on the determination."

Claim 6 has been amended to recite "determining whether the first entity is informed of the modified information based on the entity-data association." Claim 6 has also been amended to recite "transmitting the modified information about the product to the first entity based on the determination."

Claim 12 has been amended to recite "means for determining whether the first entity is automatically informed of updates based on one of the one or more update values." Claim 12 has also been amended to recite "means for sending the changed value to the first vendor in response to the determination."

Claim 15 has been amended to now recite "determining whether the first entity is informed of updates based on one of the one or more update values, and sending the changed value to the first entity based on the determination."

Support for the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 6, 12 and 15 may be found by reference to, for example, paragraphs

[0040] and [0041] of the detailed description. As such, applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments to the claims do not constitute the addition of new matter to the specification.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-9, 12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,913,210 to Call (hereinafter "Call"). Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 6, 12 and 15, the Examiner's rejection of these claims as being anticipated by Call is now moot.

In particular, applicants respectfully submit that Call does not disclose or suggest "determining whether the first entity is informed of updates based on one of the one or more update values," as is recited in claims 1 and 15. Applicants also respectfully submit that inasmuch as claims 6 and 12 include a similar limitation, Call does not disclose or suggest such limitation.

In accordance with Call's disclosure, information updates are provided to users in two ways. First, a manufacturer may, via the registration handler process 203, register with the product code translator 101. (Call, col. 3, lns. 48-53.) The registration handler process 203 "stores cross-references, or on a separate server operated by a central authority, receives each registration submission via the Internet 205 to create an incoming registration data illustrated by the data template record 207." (Id., col. 4, lns. 9-15.) As FIG. 2 and its accompanying description make clear, the information stored in template record 207 is a cross-reference that associates product codes with a manufacturer's IP address, the manufacturer's name, the manufacturer's address and its e-mail address. (Id., col. 4, ln. 15 to col. 6, ln. 52.) In accordance with this embodiment of Call, when a user requests product information, the product code translator 101 returns the

requested information to the user without making any determination of whether the user should be informed of the requested information. (Id., col. 6, lns. 53-62; see also col. 6, ln. 63 to col. 7, ln. 39; col. 2, lns. 48-52.)

Call also discloses that a manufacturer may intercept a request for a particular file, e.g., a web page, and then may dynamically write an HTML response based on the latest information available in the manufacturer's product database. (Id., col. 9, lns. 20-35.) Thus, a user is provided the requested information regardless of whether the user is authorized to receive the information. As such, Call does not make the determination of whether a user should be informed of the requested information.

Further in this regard, applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in Call is it disclosed or suggested that a determination should be made regarding whether a user should be informed of information that is requested. Stated another way, in accordance with the teachings of Call, each user that requests information is provided with such information.

In contrast, claims 1 and 15 recite "determining whether the first entity is informed of updates based on one of the one or more update values." Claim 6 similarly recites "determining whether the first entity is informed of the modified information based on the entity-data association." Claim 12 also includes a similar limitation. Applicants respectfully submit that Call does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way the foregoing limitation as is recited in claims 1, 6, 12 and 15. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that for at least this reason, these claims are not at all anticipated by Call. Furthermore, inasmuch as all of the remaining claims depend from either claims 1, 6, 12 or 15, applicants also respectfully submit that the remaining claims are also not anticipated by Call or obviated by Call or any combination of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Further in this regard, applicants also respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 is moot in view of the amendments to claim 1 and the foregoing remarks.

In responding to applicants' argument in the Amendment of March 11, 2004, the Examiner indicated that such arguments were fully considered but were not considered persuasive. (Official Action at 7-8.) Further, the Examiner requested that applicants "distinctly and specifically point out errors" in the Examiner's action. (Id.) In this regard, applicants respectfully submit that in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants have specifically pointed out that the Examiner's reliance on *Call* as identically disclosing the claimed invention is in error and respectfully believe that the Examiner will find the foregoing arguments persuasive.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By


Orville R. Cockings

Registration No.: 42,424

LENER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant